A Proposal for the Revision of the Football Bowl Subdivision's Postseason

An Honors Thesis (HONRS 499)

by

Eric Maroun

Thesis Advisor:
Dr. Stephen Avila

Stephen Avila, Ph.D.
Advisor's Signature

Ball State University
Muncie, Indiana

May 2008

Date of Graduation:
May 3, 2008

Abstract and Acknowledgements

Abstract

A ten team playoff is a more effective postseason method of determining the national champion for college football's Football Bowl Subdivision (formerly Division 1A) than the current system in place. Seemingly every year fans across the nation are heard complaining about the Bowl Championship Series and how it unfairly treated their favorite team. Most of the time, they have a legitimate gripe. The time has come to establish a system where the best team is decided by the players on the field, not by the voters in their offices or the computers in their homes. This playoff proposal examines how this method could feasibly be accomplished, and it addresses the most common arguments against a playoff.

Acknowledgements

- I would like to thank Dr. Stephen Avila for being my advisor throughout this thesis.

- I would also like to thank Ryan McCrystal of ESPN for his help in contributing ideas to the project. Ryan and I first discussed this proposal while we were seniors in high school, and this was the first time that I was able to put our ideas in a well thought out format.

Eric Maroun

HONRS 499

Dr. Stephen Avila

20 May 2008

A Proposal for the Revision of the Football Bowl Subdivision's Postseason

Mention the Bowl Championship Series (BCS) to any fan of college football, and a passionate response is almost certain to be returned. Whether in favor or opposition of it, seemingly everyone has an opinion of the BCS. Ever since its inception in 1998, the BCS has caused controversy nearly every year at the conclusion of each season. Its knack of creating disappointing bowl game match-ups has infuriated fans and caused experts to shake their respective heads. As each season passes, more and more frustrated fans have begun to call for a playoff in college football to determine the true champion and put to rest any controversy. The following proposed ten team playoff format would be a more effective way to determine the champion of the Football Bowl Subdivision (FBS), formerly known as Division 1A.

HISTORY

In order to understand the current BCS structure in place, one must first understand the series of events which led up to its creation in the late 1990s. Prior to 1992, bowl games following the regular season served as exhibition games for teams at the end of the year. Many of these games featured teams who conferences were tied into participating in those games. For example, the Big 10 and Pac-10 champions played in the Rose Bowl every year from 1947 until the BCS was formed in 1998 (BCS Chronology). However, the Big Ten instituted a rule from 1946-1971 that stipulated the

same team could not go to the Rose Bowl in two consecutive years. Thus, the second place team in the conference would be the Big 10 representative in the Rose Bowl if the champion had gone the year before (Mandel 188). The relationships between the conferences and bowls resulted in throngs of fans traveling to the host city of the bowl. The money spent by fans at these sites helped to boost the economy of the cities allowing them to support educational, charitable, and community initiatives year round. Unfortunately, while productive for the economy, the bowl tie-ins prevented intriguing matchups between two highly ranked teams who were champions of other conferences. Most often, these teams were tied to different bowl games; thus, they could never produce the contest which most fans were seeking. The system was simply not conducive to providing a true national championship game between the top two teams in the country (BCS Chronology).

Between 1991 and the early part of 1992, the Bowl Coalition (Coalition) agreement was created by four bowl committees, several conference commissioners, and Notre Dame representatives. This agreement allowed the Big East and ACC champions along with Notre Dame to face either the Big Eight champion in the Orange Bowl, SEC champion in the Sugar Bowl, or Southwest champion in the Cotton Bowl. However, if either the Big East champion, ACC champion, or Notre Dame finished the season ranked #1 or #2, they would go to the Fiesta Bowl to play for the national title. To fill their now vacated spot, a pool consisting of two teams from the ACC, Big East, Big Eight, Pac-10, and Southwest conferences would be used to select an at-large team. The Coalition was in effect from 1992-1994, and it managed to match #1 vs. #2 twice in its three years while this had occurred only eight times in the previous 56 years of postseason play.

However, the Coalition lacked in the fact that it was impossible to create some bowl matchups. For instance, the Big Eight and SEC champions could never meet in a bowl. Additionally, the Big 10 and Pac-10's lack of participation meant that neither of those champions could play another conference opponent. After three years of the original nine year contract, the Coalition came up for review. In January 1995, the Coalition agreement was ended in favor of the Bowl Alliance (BCS Chronology).

The Bowl Alliance (Alliance) system allowed the champions of the ACC, Big East, Big Eight, SEC, and Southwest Conference plus one at-large team to face each other in the Fiesta, Sugar and Orange Bowl. When the Big 12 replaced the Big Eight and Southwest Conferences in 1996, a second at-large team was added. The Bowl Alliance succeeded where the Coalition did not in two ways. First, it eliminated the conference-champion tie-ins with the Fiesta, Sugar, and Orange Bowls. This resulted in increased flexibility for the bowls in order to choose the best matchups available. Additionally, the two at-large spots were open to any Division I-A team who won a minimum of eight regular season games, were ranked in the top 12, or were not lower than the lowest-ranked Alliance conference champion. Since no conference champion was tied to a certain bowl game, national championship games between the #1 and #2 teams in the nation were possible despite conference affiliation. This allowed for a Fiesta Bowl following the 1995 regular season featuring Big 12 champion Nebraska and SEC champion Florida, a game which would have been impossible had the Coalition been in place. The Alliance remained in effect from 1995-1997 (BCS Chronology). Despite its success, the fact that two of the major conferences in the nation, the Big 10 and Pac-10, were not involved was still a problem.

After the 1997 regular season, many negotiations were held between the commissioners of the Big 10 and Pac-10 along with Rose Bowl representatives. Eventually, they came to an agreement stating that the Rose Bowl would work in a four year rotation with the Fiesta, Sugar, and Orange Bowls hosting the national championship game. In addition, if either the Big 10 or Pac-10 champion was ranked #1 or #2, they would go to the national championship in lieu of the Rose Bowl unless, of course, the Rose Bowl was the host of the title game that year. At the time, the system was known as the Super Alliance, but it was later changed to be known as the Bowl Championship Series (BCS Chronology).

The intention of the BCS was to match the two top teams at the end of the season in the national title game to determine a sole national champion (BCS Chronology). This, in theory, would prevent a split national championship from occurring. A split national championship is defined as two different teams finishing #1 in the Associated Press poll and the coaches' poll when they did not play each other during the season. A split title was seen ten times since 1950 when the coaches' poll began. Three of the ten times occurred in the 90s (1990, 1991, 1997) before the creation of the BCS (Mandel 11-12).

While the BCS sought to solve the split title problem, it simultaneously aimed to create highly competitive games in the other three affiliated bowls (BCS Chronology). Building off of the Bowl Alliance idea, the bowls not hosting the national championship would be given a great amount of flexibility in selecting the teams to appear in their games. The idea was that the creation of attractive games would drive up ticket sales and benefit both fans and the host city. In order to determine who was eligible to play in

these BCS games, a mathematical formula was created to rank teams. It incorporated the subjective polls of writers and coaches, three computer rankings, team records, and a strength of schedule component. Teams finishing #1 and #2 under this formula would meet in the national championship game while all six champions of the ACC, Big East, Big 10, Big 12, Pac-10, and SEC were guaranteed bids to the four BCS games. If an independent team in Division 1-A or champion of a non-BCS Division 1-A conference ranked sixth or higher in the BCS standings, they qualified for a bowl berth as well. The "Notre Dame rule" stated that the Fighting Irish would qualify for a BCS bowl if it was ranked in the top 10 or won at least nine games. If after all the automatic qualifiers did not fill the eight available slots, the bowls could select any team that won at least eight games and was ranked in the top 12 in the final BCS standings. Conference tie-ins to bowls were honored as long as the bowl was not hosting the national title game or a team from the conference was playing in the national championship. The Rose Bowl still had the Big Ten and Pac-10. The Fiesta Bowl took the Big 12 champion. The SEC champion went to the Sugar Bowl. And either the ACC or Big East champion headed to the Orange Bowl (BCS Chronology).

One must note that it was understood that this was not an end-all solution. "It's not perfect. We never said it was," said Roy Kramer, former SEC commissioner and primary architect of the BCS (Mandel 13). Despite this, the BCS was thought to alleviate many of the problems associated with years past. After all, a system would be in place to provide a #1 vs. #2 title game every year with all conferences taking part. However, the system would only serve to cause more controversy than ever before.

The first major controversy attributed to the BCS occurred during the 2000-2001 season. Oklahoma (12-0) finished the season undefeated and played Florida State (12-1) in the Orange Bowl for the national championship. FSU was selected to play in the title game over the Miami Hurricanes (11-1). Unfortunately for Hurricane fans, Miami was the team that handed Florida State their only loss of the season. Furthermore, Miami was ranked #2 in both the coaches and AP polls while FSU was #3 (Mandel 15). Miami went on to beat the Florida Gators 37-20 in the Sugar Bowl while FSU could only manage a safety in a 13-2 loss to Oklahoma. To compound the situation even more, the Washington Huskies (10-1) finished the season with a win in the Rose Bowl over Purdue 34-24 to end with one loss as well (All-Time Results). In order to remedy this situation, the BCS added a quality win component into its formula for the following year; this rewarded teams for beating a team in the top 15 of the BCS standings. If this had been in place for the 2000 season, the national championship would have featured Oklahoma and Miami (Mandel 15).

Towards the end of the 2001 regular season, previously undefeated Nebraska was routed 62-36 by Colorado (10-2), yet the Cornhuskers ascended to the #2 spot when four teams above them lost in the next two weeks. Nebraska was able to ride their earlier lopsided victories to such a high ranking thanks to the computers involved placing a margin-of-victory component into their formulas (Mandel 15). These victories included 48-3 over Rice, 48-7 over Baylor, and 51-7 over Kansas to name a few (Nebraska Cornhuskers). Nebraska proceeded to lose 37-14 in the Rose Bowl to Miami (All-Time Results). After the season, the margin-of-victory factor was removed from the BCS formula.

The 2003 and 2004 seasons turned out to be absolute disasters for the BCS. In 2003, the season concluded with three one loss teams. Louisiana State (12-1) and Oklahoma (12-1) were selected to play in the Sugar Bowl for the national championship over Southern California (11-1). The problem was twofold. First, USC had finished the season ranked #1 in both the AP and coaches' polls, yet they were third in the BCS standings leaving them out of the title game. Second, Oklahoma had lost its last game of the season to Kansas State 35-7 in the Big 12 conference championship game (Mandel 15). LSU predictably went on to beat Oklahoma 21-14 while USC defeated Michigan 28-14 (All-Time Results). While the coaches were contractually obligated to vote LSU as the national champions, the Associated Press was under no such constriction. The AP went ahead and declared USC the national champions for the year which resulted in just the thing that the BCS was designed to prevent: a split national title. Once again, the BCS formula was re-engineered. This time, the human polls, which previously made up 25% of the final ranking, now accounted for 66% of the score (Mandel 16). It took until the next season for this to cause yet another problem.

Auburn, Oklahoma, and USC all finished the 2004 regular season undefeated meaning that for the first time under the BCS, a BCS conference team would have gone undefeated and not get to play in the national championship (Mandel 16). USC and Oklahoma were selected to go to the title game while Auburn was relegated to the Sugar Bowl where they beat Virginia Tech 16-13. Meanwhile in the championship game, USC throttled Oklahoma 55-19 (All-Time Results). Outside the championship game, further controversy arose when Texas coach Mack Brown's continuing public pleas helped to sway enough voters to rank his 10-1 Longhorns over the California Bears, also a 10-1

squad, after the final week of the season. This resulted in Texas being selected to the Rose Bowl over Pac-10 member Cal. Convinced that a severe conflict of interest among voters was to blame for this, the Associated Press lawyers issued a cease and desist letter to the BCS prohibiting the BCS from using the AP poll in any future formulas (Mandel 16).

Despite the numerous controversies involved with the system, BCS officials announced in 2004 that a fifth game would be added to the BCS slate of games. Television network ABC suggested that the fifth game be used as part of a "plus-one" playoff system where the two best teams after the BCS bowls concluded would play a final game to determine the national champion. The BCS rejected this idea, and ABC elected not to renew its contract with the BCS although it did retain the rights to air the Rose Bowl every year on January 1. FOX then proceeded to pick up the other four BCS games despite not broadcasting a single college football game other than the Cotton Bowl throughout the year (Mandel 17).

Although Roy Kramer said in 1999, "Controversy isn't all bad. It keeps people interested in the game, keeps them talking about it," many of these same people are calling for a playoff of some sort to be instituted in college football. Actually, to clarify, they are calling for a playoff in Division 1-A college football; Division 1-AA, II, and III already have playoff systems in place. In fact, every NCAA sponsored sport aside from Division 1-A college football ends their season with a tournament to crown a champion. The fact of the matter is, however, four main roadblocks stand in the way of a playoff coming to fruition. These groups can be identified as follows: conference commissioners and athletic directors, university presidents and chancellors, bowl games, and television

networks (Mandel 18). Each of these entities has their own reasons which have provided a major hindrance in the past.

Conference commissioners and athletic directors are essentially out for one thing: revenue. Many athletic directors will acknowledge the fact that schools rely on football and men's basketball to bring in enough money to support the other sports in the athletic program. "An NFL-style football playoff would provide three to four times as many dollars to the Big Ten as the current system does. There is no doubt in my mind that we are leaving hundreds of millions of dollars on the table," Big Ten commissioner Jim Delany said in 2005 (Mandel 18-19). If the bottom line is monetarily driven, then why is a playoff still lacking?

The answer to the previous question lies in the sheer greediness of the commissioners and athletic directors; their intention is to keep the money to themselves and be unwilling to share. Of the $125.9 million in revenue generated by the four BCS games following the 2005 season, the six BCS conferences and Notre Dame were on the receiving end of all but $7 million. The other five Division 1-A conferences got $5.2 million to split and eight 1-AA conferences divided up the other $1.8 million. Beginning with the 2006 regular season, non-BCS conferences receive 9% of the net revenues generated from the five BCS games which comes out to approximately $9 million. If a non-BCS conference team plays in a BCS game, the conference's share is doubled. The problem lies in the fact that the entire Division 1 membership would have to approve a move to a playoff structure, even if it is a plus-one system. In this case, the BCS conferences are in the minority. The non-BCS teams would push for the NCAA to control the playoff resulting in a more equitable distribution of revenue across the college

football landscape. A fairer payout theoretically means a reduced bottom line for the BCS conference commissioners, and this is simply not something they are ready to do (Mandel 19-20).

Additionally, despite the plethora of merchandising, TV contracts, and bowl money available, the main source of revenue for most athletic departments is ticket sales. Athletic directors and commissioners are afraid that the meaning of the twelve game regular season would be drastically reduced if a playoff was implemented. All of the sudden, season ending games which could determine who went to the national championship game, such as the #1 vs. #2 matchup between undefeated Ohio State and undefeated Michigan in 2006, would simply be a contest to determine seeding for the tournament (Mandel 20). Decreased importance of games may lead to decreased attendance – a scenario no one wants to see.

University presidents and chancellors are typically more concerned with running their respective educational institutions than worrying about college football's postseason, but the fact remains that football brings in a substantial amount of money to college campuses. Therefore, it's hard for them not to be involved in it. Back in the summer of 2003, a committee of presidents and chancellors from the BCS conferences met to discuss changes to the postseason in college football. Nebraska University President Harvey Pearlman summed up the committee's discussion by saying, "We have instructed the conference commissioners to not pursue … an NFL-style playoff system for postseason collegiate football." The reason behind this sentiment is that presidents feel a playoff would liken the sport too much to its professional counterpart, a step towards the promotion of excess commercialization. Stewart Mandel points out on page

22 and 23 that this has not stopped them previously from participating in the March Madness basketball tournament where only water cups featuring a Dasani logo are allowed courtside nor has anyone expressed opposition to participating in the Chik-fil-A Bowl, Pioneer PureVision Las Vegas Bowl, and other corporate influenced events. Additionally, the presidents fear that the season would become too long and conflict with finals schedule. Mandel once again points out that not only do lower division football teams participate in playoffs during this time period, but there has never been an uproar from the same presidents when March Madness occurs during finals week for schools on the quarter system (Mandel 23). Essentially, the presidents and chancellors offer the weakest argument against a playoff; however, they are inherently forced to look out for the academic well being of the students that they preside over due to their position in the university and commitment to education.

The next group of playoff opponents is the bowl games. The biggest fear that bowl game officials have is that fans will not be willing to travel across the country to watch their teams play in a game which is merely a stepping stone to the next round of the playoffs as opposed to the season ending reward which it is presently. Many fans save up money to spend a week with their team in a destination such as Pasadena, California (home of the Rose Bowl), or Tempe, Arizona, site of the Fiesta Bowl. Most fans do not have the funds, nor the vacation time, to travel to Pasadena one week and the national championship game the next. The financial impact on the local economy would be felt by a combination of a lower turnout of fans or people arriving in the city later in the week rather than making it a week long trip (Mandel 25).

Much like the athletic directions and conference commissioners, the television networks are interested in money. Despite the fact that the Boise State vs. Oklahoma Fiesta Bowl from January 2007 ranked as arguably one of the most exciting games of all-time with BSU coming back in the final seconds to beat Oklahoma on two trick plays in overtime, the game drew the third lowest Nielsen rating, 8.7, of any of the 37 BCS games ever played. The only other two lower rated games were the Utah vs. Pittsburgh Fiesta Bowl from 2005 (7.4 rating) and the Wake Forest vs. Louisville Orange Bowl from 2007 (7.0). Television networks certainly took note that all three of these games featured non-traditional powers in the college football world. After all, in the words of former CBS Sports president Neal Pilson, "The marketplace has established that the major revenue streams go to the bigger schools and conferences because they generate larger audiences." ABC noticed this and, as a result, dropped their bid from $25 million per game for the four BCS games to $17 million per game when the BCS expanded to five games. Quite simply, the fifth game opened up more opportunities for non-BCS teams, or historically less prominent BCS teams, to make a BCS bowl. Television networks are interested in concepts that would bring added value to its product. Simply translated, more viewers mean more advertising dollars which brings added value (Mandel 29-30). With all of these hurdles in mind, the following details a proposal for a new format for the FBS postseason: a ten team playoff.

A ten team playoff structure is a format which no other sport uses. In baseball, Major League Baseball features eight teams. For basketball, the National Basketball Association has 16 teams which qualify. All true sports fans are familiar with the NCAA basketball tournament known as March Madness which affords 64 teams, technically 65

teams if one counts the play-in game, a chance to play for its championship. The National Football League is the closest to the proposed ten team plan as it has 12 teams qualify with the top two teams in each conference, four teams overall, receiving bye weeks as a reward for a superior record. That being said, the ten team playoff would be a radical change in the sports landscape; however, it is just the right proposal which has the potential to satisfy all parties involved.

RANKING SYSTEM

Teams will be ranked by using the following formula:

Poll Average + Computer Average + Strength of Schedule = Subtotal

Subtotal + Loss Component – Quality Win Component = FINAL RANKING

Poll average = ((Points in Associated Press ranking / 1500) + (Points in the Harris Interactive Poll / 2850)) / 2.

Computer Average - The six computer rankings used shall be Anderson & Hester, Richard Billingsley, Colley Matrix, Kenneth Massey, Jeff Sagarin, and Peter Wolfe. All computer rankings are calculated with a team receiving 25 points for a #1 ranking, 24 points for #2, etc. The best and worst ranking for each team is thrown out, and the remaining four rankings are added together and divided by 4 to produce a Computer Average. The team with the highest computer average of the top 25 teams will be awarded 1.0 points, second highest .96 points, and so on until .04 points are awarded to the team with the lowest computer average.

Strength of Schedule = (2/3 * opponents' winning percentage) * (1/3 * opponents' opponents winning percentage)

The team with the toughest SOS of the top 25 teams will be awarded 1.0 points, second toughest .96 points, and so on until .04 points are awarded to the team with the lowest SOS.

Quality Win Component – A team shall add 1.0 points for beating the team with the #1 ranked subtotal, add .9 points for beating the team with the #2 ranked subtotal, and so on until adding .1 points for beating the team with the #10 ranked subtotal.

Loss Component = (-0.5 * Number of losses)/(Combined winning percentage of teams lost to)

EXPLANATION

The poll average component allows for human assessment of the teams in the country. Traditionally, the biggest problem that people have had with the human polls is twofold. First, biases exist among coaches. A coach may rank a school he previously coached at or his alma mater higher than the rest of the coaches. He may also rank teams that his team has on its schedule higher in an effort to boost his own team's strength of schedule. On the other hand, a coach may rank teams ahead of his team in the national rankings slightly lower in an attempt to leapfrog that team during the following week. With a number of coaches having incentives in their contract rewarding them for finishing a certain spot in the rankings (top 5, top 10, top 25, etc.), a team's final ranking can mean hundreds of thousands of dollars.

This is the most difficult issue to address with the polls because it, at its core, is simply an opinion poll. Despite the ulterior motives that may be present, a coach theoretically should not lose his vote simply because he goes against the grain of the national opinion. As long as he can provide a rational explanation for his rankings, little

can be done about it. However, there does have to be a check and balance system in place in order to prevent things from getting out of control.

The best solution to this problem is to establish a discipline system for anyone whose rankings are statistically and significantly different than the final poll. This can be accomplished by observing the rankings of every coach for every team at the end of the year. Each team will then have a set of rankings which should be ordered lowest to highest. From there, the interquartile range (IQR) can be calculated by subtracted the value of the first quartile (where 25% of the rankings are lower than it) from the value of the third quartile (where 25% of the rankings are higher than it). An outlier in the data is observed if $X < Q_1 - (1.5 * IQR)$ or $X > Q_3 + (1.5 * IQR)$ where X is the ranking. If a coach is found to have two or more team rankings that are considered outliers, he would lose his voting rights for two years.

The second problem with the human polls is the existence of preseason polls. Imagine a professor beginning a semester by looking at his incoming students' work from the previous year, and then the students are ranked from smartest to least smart person in the class. As the class progresses, the smartest people can afford to lose a few points here and there while remaining at the top of the class; however, those at the bottom must be near perfect in all of their assignments if they hope to ascend to the top of the class. This is essentially the same logic used in preseason polls. Teams that are ranked higher at the beginning of the season can afford to lose a game knowing that they have less room to make up to get back to the top as opposed to a lower ranked team. Only 14 of the past 72 seasons, less than 20%, saw the number one ranked team in the preseason finish the season in the same position. Tommy Tuberville, Auburn's coach whose 2004 squad was

shut out of the title game despite starting the season 18th and going undefeated, said, "If you're going to have this system, then the polls should start around the first of October" (Mandel 51). Tuberville's reasoning stems from the fact that by approximately the fifth week of the season, voters will have a better idea of which teams are good and which aren't. In the proposed ten team playoff format, the first official polls will not be released until after the fifth week of the regular season has concluded.

Next, the computer rankings provide an unbiased ranking for teams. The advantage of computer rankings is that they cannot be persuaded by the media or other outside forces. They solely go off of statistics and records of teams in order to form their rankings. The computer rankings provide the objectivity needed in the overall ranking while the human polls provide the subjectivity required as well. Throwing out the highest and lowest ratings in the formula also allows for a more normalized score and reduces the threat of outliers in the rankings. Since the computers use rankings and not points like the coaches' poll and Harris poll, a way to award points to the teams must be created. Therefore, the team with the best computer average is awarded 1.00 point, the second best team .96 point, and so on until the 25th ranked team by the computers is awarded .04 point. If two or more teams have the same computer average, they each shall be awarded the higher number of points corresponding to that position in the rankings. The number of points awarded thereafter shall be given as if there were no ties. For example, if Team A and Team B each have the third highest computer average at 22.5, they each shall receive .92 point. Team C, with the fourth ranked computer average of 22, would receive .84 point. No team in this instance would be awarded .88 points.

The strength of schedule component used in this formula is the same one that was originally in the BCS formula. By factoring in both opponents' winning percentages and opponents opponents' winning percentage, this helps to deter teams from scheduling easy wins on their schedule by playing a team that may only win a handful of games in a given year. Additionally, it discourages teams from scheduling opponents who may post a strong winning record during the year against inferior competition. For example, teams are not going to want to play against perennial college football loser Duke who may go 0-12 on the year because that would hurt the team's strength of schedule. Along the same lines, they may not schedule a team prone to go 12-0 in a weak conference because this would effect the opponents opponents' part of the equation. Much like the computer average component, there must be some way to quantify and rank the teams in this part of the formula. It is ineffective to rank a BCS team's schedule with that of, for instance, a Mountain West Conference team on a 1-119 system. Therefore, the teams are ranked in comparison to those in the top 25. Once again, the team with the best strength of schedule will receive 1.00 point, the team with the second best schedule .96 point, and so on until the 25th ranked team according to schedule strength is awarded .04 point.

From here, a team's subtotal would be calculated by adding together the components that have been explored thus far: poll average, computer average, and strength of schedule. The teams are reordered based on their subtotal for the final part of the formula.

Quality wins are included as a reward to teams for beating one of the top 10 teams in the nation. If a team has beaten the team with the best subtotal in the nation, they are awarded 1.0 point. For beating the team with the second best subtotal, a team shall be

awarded .9 point. This continues throughout the rankings until a win over the team with the tenth ranked subtotal is worth .1 point. There are no points awarded for beating a team outside the top ten. It should be noted that these points are awarded for each time that a team beats another team ranked in the top ten of the subtotal rankings. For example, if Team A is ranked #2 in the subtotal rankings but has lost twice over the course of the season to Team B, Team B would be given .9 points for each victory, or 1.8 points overall. This scenario is theoretically limited to instances in which two teams play in the conference championship game after having already played each other during the regular season.

Lastly, the loss component is something that has never been introduced as part of any formula the BCS has ever used. The premise of the loss formula revolves around the fact that losing to a team that was 8-3 and losing to a team that was 11-0 was previously only reflected in the judgment of the voters. In essence, a loss was a loss no matter who the opponent happened to be. The loss component treats each loss as half of a loss for the equation. This is then divided by the winning percentage of the teams that beat said team. This way, a loss to a team which is 11-0 only counts as -.5000 point in the rankings while a loss to an 8-3 team deducts .6875 point. Basically, teams are punished more harshly for losing to inferior teams than to the elite teams in the nation.

When all of these calculations have been completed, a final score can be compiled. The team with the highest final score will be ranked #1 in the final rankings that are used for the seeding of the playoffs. The format for the playoffs is detailed below.

FORMAT

Rankings for the teams in the playoff shall be determined by the formula stated above. The top ten ranked teams will qualify for the playoff and be seeded accordingly with the highest ranked team receiving the #1 seed, second highest the #2 seed, etc. In the instance of a tie, the team with the best strength of schedule shall possess the tiebreaker. If the teams are still tied, the following components are examined in order until one team wins the tiebreaker: quality wins, poll average, computer average, loss component. If the teams are still tied, the team with the most points scored during the regular season will win the tiebreaker. In the event that every tiebreaking option fails to settle the tie, a coin flip will determine the tiebreaker.

The ten team playoff is structured in such a way that six of the ten teams in the field receive a bye to the second round. In the first round, the 7^{th} ranked team plays the 10^{th} ranked team with the winner advancing to play the #2 seed. Also, the 8^{th} ranked team faces the 9^{th} ranked team with the winner playing the #1 seed the following week. Other second round games will feature the #6 seed playing at the #3 seed and the #5 ranked team playing the #4 ranked team.

This system is designed to reward teams for a successful regular season in a number of ways. Unlike the current BCS, there is no limit to the number of teams which can qualify from a certain conference. Within in the playoff itself, teams ranked #9 and #10 are given the chance to play for a national championship for the first time in a playoff setting although they will have the hardest path to travel to get to the title game. These teams will play their first two games against their opponents who are playing in their home stadiums. Conversely, teams ranked #7 and #8 get to play in the comforts of

their own home in round one against one of the two lowest ranked teams in the playoff field; however, the winner of these 8/9 and 7/10 games are forced to go on the road against either the #1 or #2 ranked team in the second round. Teams ranked #5 and #6 get the luxury of a first round bye week; however, they must play either the #3 or #4 ranked team on the road. As a result, teams ranked #3 and #4 get a first round bye and the chance to play a home game against either the #5 or #6 team. Lastly, the #1 and #2 ranked teams in the nation are given both a bye and a second round game on their home field against one of the bottom four teams in the playoffs who will have already played a game the week prior to their match-up.

After the first two rounds have been played, the final four teams will play their games at the site of a current BCS bowl game on New Year's Day. These sites are the Rose Bowl (located in Pasadena, CA), Fiesta Bowl (Tempe, AZ), Sugar Bowl (New Orleans, LA), and Orange Bowl (Miami, FL). The championship game will be held at the site of the winner of the #1 vs. #8/#9 game. Assuming that the #1 team wins, this provides another incentive for teams to finish #1 in the final rankings. They will not have to travel in the week between the semifinals and national championship game. If the #8 or #9 team prevails, this serves as their reward for beating the top team in the nation. Additionally, they will already have the experience of playing on that field.

In order prevent teams from traveling across the nation in one week, a rotation would be set up to repeat every four years. This ensures that a team will never travel from one stadium to another while bypassing the site of another BCS bowl game. Also, it means that each BCS bowl city is guaranteed to host exactly two semifinal games and a national championship game in a three year span. Of course, one of the semifinal games

and national championship game will be hosted in the same year. The rotation of the semifinal games and national championship since 1998 can be seen in the table below.

Years	Semifinal #1	Semifinal #2	National Championship
1998, 2002, 2006,	Rose Bowl Pasadena, CA	Fiesta Bowl Tempe, AZ	National Championship Pasadena, CA
1999, 2003, 2007,	Sugar Bowl New Orleans, LA	Orange Bowl Miami, FL	National Championship New Orleans, LA
2000, 2004, 2008,	Fiesta Bowl Tempe, AZ	Rose Bowl Pasadena, CA	National Championship Tempe, AZ
2001, 2005, 2009	Orange Bowl Miami, FL	Sugar Bowl New Orleans, LA	National Championship Miami, FL

In the years that a city does not play host to any of the games relating to the national championship playoff, bowl tie-ins are exercised. Therefore, during the years that the Rose Bowl is not involved as a playoff site, e.g. in odd years, the Big 10 and Pac-10 teams possessing the best conference records that are not in the playoffs would face each other. Also in odd years, the Fiesta Bowl would pit the best Big 12 conference team remaining against an at-large team. Even numbered years will see the Sugar Bowl take the top SEC representative left and an at-large squad while the Orange Bowl will feature the top ACC team outstanding facing an at-large team as well. Officials of the bowls with at-large selections have the option to determine whether they want this team to be the highest ranked non-playoff participant or another team that is not in the playoffs.

It should be noted that if there are no teams from a particular BCS conference who are bowl eligible to fill the spot slotted for that conference, an at-large team may take its place. Bowl eligible is defined as having a record at the end of the regular season of at least .500. For example, if three teams from the Big 10 make the playoffs and no other team in the conference is above .500, the Rose Bowl may select an at-large team from outside the Big 10 to fill its spot to play the Pac-10 representative. While this is

unlikely to arise, it provides an answer for years in which there is a gaping disparity between the top and bottom teams in a conference.

BENEFITS

The ten team playoff system that has been proposed has numerous benefits and provides a rebuttal to many of the concerns voiced by anti-playoff advocates. First, it implements a playoff system which has been lacking in college football since the sport has come into existence. In late 2007, a Gallup poll revealed that only 15% of respondents said that they preferred the BCS system as opposed to a playoff (Reuters). While some college football fans claim that a playoff system would ruin the tradition of the game, this tradition has already been tainted. In reality, it's difficult to determine exactly what tradition people would like to keep. After all, the BCS has only been in existence for one decade. Is that the tradition that is trying to be kept? The BCS itself was a radical change at the time from the past, yet some traditionalists today are in favor of maintaining this as the status quo. Or is it maintaining the sacredness of games such as the Rose Bowl, Sugar Bowl, and Orange Bowl? The fact of the matter is that moving away from "tradition" is not a bad thing. Not only is it not bad, but it has already happened. Since it was regularly played on an annual basis beginning in 1916, the Rose Bowl resisted a corporate sponsor unlike the Tostitos Fiesta Bowl, FedEx Orange Bowl, and others. After all, it was "tradition." However, that changed in 1998 when Rose Bowl officials agreed to let AT&T sponsor the game and called the 1999 game the Rose Bowl Game presented by AT&T (Sandomir). Since then, the Rose Bowl has been presented by Sony's Playstation 2 and most recently Citi (J-Red). This helps to prove that even the

most traditional of the bowl games has realized that the landscape of college football is changing; those in charge need to realize this as well and institute a playoff.

Another valid complaint offered by those against a playoff is that a playoff would put too much pressure on the students because it would result in too many games being played. Before 2006, most college football teams played eleven games in the regular season. Some teams would then play in a conference championship game if the conference had a title game in place, and there was also an opportunity to go to a bowl. Some schools would even schedule twelve or thirteen regular season games. Before the 2006 season, the NCAA approved the addition of a 12th regular season game for all teams. This resulted in top tier teams scrambling to find an extra game for their schedule against lesser opponents. In essence, these teams were paying for a victory in most cases. In 2006, Troy University received $750,000 to play at Nebraska, a 56-0 victory for the Cornhuskers. That same season, both Auburn and Wisconsin wrote a check to the University of Buffalo for $600,000 each. Buffalo had been offered to play West Virginia for $300,000, but dropped the Mountaineers from the schedule after being offered double the amount from Wisconsin (Thamel). Buffalo lost by a combined score of 73-10 in the two games they played (Buffalo Bulls Schedule).

It's ironic that the NCAA fully approved the addition of a regular season game, yet refuses to implement a playoff because it would be too much work for the athletes. The answer to this is simple: remove the requirement that all teams play twelve regular season games. Currently, only five conferences have conference championship games: ACC, Big 12, C-USA, MAC, and SEC. These conferences would have the option of playing either ten or eleven regular season games. All other conferences which do not

have a conference championship game would be required to play eleven regular season games. The ten team playoff has a maximum of four rounds. At the absolute maximum, a team would play sixteen games, the equivalent of an NFL regular season. However, this would occur only in the case of a team scheduling eleven regular season games, playing in the conference championship, being seeded between seventh and tenth in the playoffs, and making it to the championship game by beating three of the top ten teams in the span of four weeks. In other words, it is highly unlikely that a team would play sixteen games in a season. More realistically, a team would play either fourteen or fifteen games during the course of the season with fourteen being the most likely scenario. To say that college athletes are unable to handle this workload is not necessarily true; after all, it wouldn't be the first time that this has happened.

The Miami Redhawks played 14 games, including wins in the Mid-American Conference championship game and GMAC Bowl, and finished the 2003 season with 13-1 record (Miami (OH) Redhawks Schedule). A year prior, the Ohio State Buckeyes won the national championship at the Fiesta Bowl to complete a perfect 14-0 season after playing 13 regular season games (Ohio State Buckeyes Schedule). In fact, since 2002, four of the six BCS national champions have played 14 games during the season (College Football National Champions). Quite simply, the precedent exists that college athletes are able to play 14 games in a single season.

Next, this playoff proposal addresses the most common concerns voiced by anti-playoff advocates. As mentioned earlier, the conference commissioners and athletic directors are most concerned with the financials involved with college football's postseason. This system is designed to allow for both BCS conference teams and non-

BCS conference teams to benefit without changing the revenue distribution from the way that it is currently set up. This is possible because of, in Jim Delany's words, the hundreds of millions of dollars which could be generated by a playoff. Television experts have estimated that a playoff could potentially result in anywhere from a 60% to 300% increase in rights fees from television networks alone. While the current BCS games account for $120 million annually, the NCAA March Madness basketball tournament earns approximately $545 million each year (Mandel 34). In reality, the BCS conferences are not getting a smaller percentage of the pie, the pie is merely growing larger. Non-BCS conferences would be in favor of this because of the greater chance that exists to make the playoffs. Currently, a mid-major team may be skipped over by one of the BCS bowls who are selecting at-large teams because the mid-major may not generate as much revenue for the game. In the proposed playoff, all a non-BCS conference team has to do is finish in the top ten of the final standings in order to get a chance to play for a national championship, provided that they can win two or three games in a row. Also, this allows for them to receive more money for their programs in order to upgrade facilities, offer scholarships, and apply to other areas of the athletics department in need.

Another concern of the athletic directors and commissioners is that the meaning of the regular season will be reduced if a playoff was implemented. Those against the idea of a playoff frequently point out that one of the best parts about college football is that every week has a do-or-die feel to it. One loss could theoretically cost a team their chance at a national title. If a playoff is instituted, traditional rivalry games such as Ohio State vs. Michigan, Auburn vs. Alabama, USC vs. UCLA, and others will lose their importance if it's merely a game for seeding in the playoff instead of a season altering

game. In fact, not only will the players not care as much about the game, but there is less incentive present for fans to attend the game which would result in the loss of ticket sales.

While a playoff could potentially reduce the so called importance of certain games and remove the "one loss and you're out" mentality from college football, the playoff provides other benefits relating to this point. First, the importance of some games may be increased as a result of this. For example, in the current system, if Ohio State is ranked #3 and Michigan is ranked #10 going into their final game of the season, Michigan would most likely be playing for a spot in the Capital One Bowl while OSU would be aiming for the Rose Bowl. It's possible that neither team would have a chance at a national championship no matter the result of the game. With a playoff in place, all of the sudden the game becomes a fight to make the playoffs. Ohio State has the chance to keep Michigan from having a shot at the national title while Michigan has the opportunity to earn itself at least a chance in the playoffs, if not a first round home game or possibly even a bye to the second round.

Secondly, removing the "one loss and you're out" mentality can be a good thing when it comes to future out of conference games. The combination of having strength of schedule being a significant component in the new BCS formula, the loss component taking into account opponents' winning percentages if a team loses, and one loss not necessarily meaning the end of a team's title hopes, a team may be inclined to schedule better out of conference competition. Fans could see games throughout the year such as Texas vs. USC, West Virginia vs. Oklahoma, or LSU vs. Wisconsin because a loss doesn't mean that it's nearly an impossible road back to the championship game. Back in 2006, perennial Big Ten powerhouse Michigan beat Ball State 34-26 late in the season.

The Cardinals went on to finish the season 5-7. If BSU would have pulled out the victory, the Wolverines certainly would have plummeted in the rankings whether the current BCS ranking system or newly proposed one was used. However, if UM would have scheduled a team such as Auburn, a team that finished the 2006 season with an 11-2 record, and lost, the drop would not be as significant. Essentially, teams will no longer have to shy away from strong out of conference schedules under the new system.

Lastly, even if the games were just for seeding purposes, as anti-playoff proponents point out, the seeding is in fact important. The chart below shows the teams with the best winning percentage on their home field from 2000-2006.

Rank	Team	Home Winning Percentage
1	Boise State	.976
2	Oklahoma	.955
3	Texas	.928
4	Toledo	.900
5	Michigan	.891
6	Louisville	.880
7	LSU	.877
8	Ohio State	.875
9	TCU	.871
10	Miami (FL)	.863

Table by Home Field Advantage

Eight of the ten teams shown in the chart have played in at least one BCS bowl game, and seven of the teams hail from BCS conferences. Clearly, these teams enjoy a

monumental advantage by playing at home. A team that is in the top four is highly unlikely to rest their starters in the last week of the season just because they seemingly have a playoff spot locked up. For one, there is always the danger that they may fall completely out of the top ten and not make the playoffs. More realistically, losing the final game of the season may be the difference between playing in the comforts of a team's home stadium and traveling across the country to play an opponent on the road. As mentioned previously, while six teams play their first game at home, only four of them receive a first round bye and a home game.

Certainly, enough incentive exists in the proposed playoff to prevent teams from resting their starters in the last few weeks of the season. While this phenomenon of resting players late in the season exists in the NFL, where teams are seeded for the playoffs based on their record and standing in the conference, it would not happen in college football as a result of the subjectivity of the rankings due to human votes playing a factor in the final rankings. Thus, the myth that the importance of the regular season is reduced can be debunked by the proposed playoff system.

The next concerns arise from the university leaders: presidents and chancellors. Their priorities lie with the educational aspect of the student-athletes. At universities, especially ones that are football rabid schools, exceptions are made for athletes all the time. Most universities provide athletes with priority scheduling, tutors, and study tables throughout the year in order to help them with their courses in between practices and games. There is no reason why the same services cannot be provided through finals week during the fall semester. Many schools follow approximately the same schedule throughout the year as well. Therefore, it's unlikely that one team will be practicing

during finals week while the other can afford to put in a full week of practice just like any other week during the season. Additionally, this provides yet another incentive for teams to finish in the top six of the final standings. Only the two first round games would take place during the aforementioned finals week. As a result, only four teams would be affected by this, and they would be the four lowest ranked teams. Some schools have no problem allowing their teams to practice for March Madness during the finals week of those on the quarter system, there is no reason that the same accommodations cannot be made during football season.

Next, the main concern of bowl game officials is that people are not going to want to follow their team all across the country to numerous spots. While it is understandable many fans will not be able to afford to attend each playoff game, this would allow for more unique fans to witness their team in action. Rather than having the same 50,000 people at each game, a team could potentially draw 50,000 fans to their first game, and 50,000 people to their next game. However, that second game might be made up of 30,000 fans that were not in attendance at the first playoff game. These new fans could be those who were busy the week before or simply could not receive tickets due to them being sold out. This presents the opportunity for more merchandise to be sold in relation to the bowl games while simultaneously addressing the fear that tourism to cities would drop significantly. While the hardcore fans will find a way to make the traveling schedule and budget work, casual fans will have the opportunity to finally see their favorite team without fear of not being able to get a ticket. As an added bonus, the games take place over the winter break of schools making going to a game the perfect holiday vacation for families who want to enjoy a football playoff game in the winter months.

Lastly, the television networks are concerned that having non-traditional powers participating in college football's postseason is a bad thing. When Boise State beat Oklahoma in the Fiesta Bowl to go undefeated, few people were watching. Part of this can be attributed to the fact that win or lose, Boise State's dream season would be over after the game. If, however, Boise State's win propelled them to another game against a second BCS conference team, there is a strong possibility that people would start to notice the Broncos in the same way that the public noticed relatively unknown George Mason's Final Four run in 2006 during the March Madness tournament. In the three weeks that George Mason was in the tournament, CBS saw the Nielsen Ratings for its tournament games increase from 6.1 to 8.2 to 8.8 (zap2it.com). More people were tuning into the games as the underdog continued to win. Of course, BCS conference teams are always going to draw strong ratings due to their national presence. If television networks can be shown that non-BCS teams have drawing power as well, they could be convinced to air the games without fear of losing money.

Going back to a previous idea, television networks are most interested in concepts that bring added value to the product. With the yearly outcries from college football fans for a playoff, putting a playoff on television would be the perfect solution to this problem. After clamoring for such a long time for a playoff, fans would be certain to tune into the games. As viewership increases, so do the opportunities for advertisements. Sponsors would be more likely to put their money towards these playoff games featuring two of the top ten teams in the country as opposed to a lower rated bowl that currently takes place. In this way, all parties are satisfied. Fans get the playoff system that they have so desperately been seeking. One lucky television network gets to attract a large

audience and can promote their own original shows throughout the tournament. Advertisers get to spread their messages to this same audience and entice them to buy the product or service which is being sold.

In conclusion, the playoff versus no playoff debate can be summarized as follows: the argument exists between one camp of people that feel it's OK to allow some undeserving teams a shot at a title and another camp of people that feel it's OK to deny some deserving teams a shot at the title without any definition or subjective way to determine what constitutes 'deserving' or 'undeserving.' Each college football fan will always be entitled to his opinion on how the best way is to conduct the postseason. Unfortunately, those who are in favor of a playoff will have to wait until at least 2014 for a playoff to occur after conference commissioners voted down a proposed plus-one playoff proposal in May 2008. This would have created a mini four team playoff with the top two teams in the country facing off after the bowl games had concluded (Schlabach). Until then, fans will be forced to endure the BCS for years to come, a fate that is certainly undeserving.

Works Cited

"All-Time Results." Bowl Championship Series Official Website. 11 Sep. 2007. Fox Sports. 10 Mar. 2008 <http://www.bcsfootball.org/bcsfb/results>.

"BCS Chronology." Bowl Championship Series Official Website. 2 Mar. 2007. Fox Sports. 2 Feb. 2008 <http://www.bcsfootball.org/bcsfb/history>.

"Buffalo Bulls Schedule - 2006." ESPN.com. 8 Mar. 2008 <http://www.espn.com>. Path: College Football; Teams; Buffalo; Schedule; 2006.

"College Football National Champions." Hickok Sports. 15 Apr. 2008. 19 Apr. 2008 <http://www.hickoksports.com/history/cfchamps.shtml>.

"Home Field Advantage." 2007 College Football. Surefire Scouting. 1 May 2008 <http://mysite.verizon.net/vzep20k8/index_files/2006CollegeFootball.htm>. Path: Home Field Advantage.

J-Red. "Traditionalist's Guide to Bowl Games." Weblog entry. 29 Dec. 2007. East Coast Bias. 10 Apr. 2008 <http://www.east-coast-bias.com/2007/12/traditionalists-guide-to-bowl-games.html>.

Mandel, Stewart. Bowls, Polls, & Tattered Souls. Hoboken: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 2007.

"Miami (OH) Redhawks Schedule - 2003." ESPN.com. 8 Mar. 2008 <http://www.espn.com>. Path: College Football; Teams; Miami (OH); Schedule; 2003.

"Ohio State Buckeyes Schedule - 2002." ESPN.com. 8 Mar. 2008 <http://www.espn.com>. Path: College Football; Teams; Ohio State; Schedule; 2002.

"Nebraska Cornhuskers 2001 Schedule." National Champs. 10 Mar. 2008 <http://www.nationalchamps.net/NCAA/college_football_2001_schedules/nebraska.htm>.

Reuters, and Hollywood Reporter. "Fox hopes for college football fireworks." Reuters. 28 Dec. 2007. 19 Apr. 2008 <http://www.reuters.com/>.

Sandomir, Richard. " TV SPORTS; A Private Line for the Rose Bowl." New York Times. 1 Jan. 1999. 7 May 2008 <http://www.nytimes.com/>.

Schlabach, Mark. "BCS will not change current non-playoff system." ESPN.com. 5 May 2008. 8 May 2008 <http://www.espn.com>.

Thamel, Pete. "In College Football, Big Paydays for Humiliation." New York Times. 23 Aug. 2006. 1 May 2008 <http://www.nytimes.com/2006/08/23/sports/ncaafootball/23college.html>.

Zap2it. "ABC Boxes Out CBS Sunday." zap2it. 27 Mar. 2006. 14 Apr. 2008 <http://www.zap2it.com/search/dispatcher.front>.

Appendix A

Using the newly created formula detailed on pages 13-14, the following spreadsheets show the final rankings for four of the most controversial seasons since the creation of the BCS. These include the 2003, 2004, 2006, and 2007 regular seasons. The final, original BCS rankings have been included for comparison purposes as well. Additionally, the bottom of each of the spreadsheets show the playoff matchups which would result from the new rankings. These show the locations, dates, and bowls (if applicable) pertaining to each game.

2003 FINAL STANDINGS

Team	Pts. Coach	% Coach	Pts. AP	% AP	Poll Avg.	AH	RB	CM	KM	JS	PW	Comp. Avg.	Comp. Pts.	SOS	SOS Comp	Subtotal	Subtotal Rank	Quality Win	Loss Comp	Final Score
Oklahoma	1449	0.9200	1491	0.9175	0.9188	~~25~~	~~25~~	25	~~24~~	25	25	25.00	1.00	.550	0.80	2.7188	1	0.4	-0.6364	2.4824
Michigan	1393	0.8844	1437	0.8843	0.8844	~~19~~	~~22~~	20	21	21	21	20.75	0.88	.543	0.76	2.5244	3	0.6	-1.4118	1.7126
USC	1542	0.9790	1595	0.9815	0.9803	~~23~~	23	23	23	~~22~~	23	23.00	0.92	.516	0.68	2.5803	2		-0.9286	1.6517
LSU	1516	0.9625	1580	0.9723	0.9674	~~24~~	~~24~~	~~24~~	~~25~~	~~24~~	~~24~~	24.00	0.96	.474	0.36	2.2874	6		-0.7500	1.5374
Miami (FL)	1092	0.6933	1075	0.6615	0.6774	17	~~21~~	19	17	~~15~~	17	17.50	0.68	.529	0.72	2.0774	9	0.7	-1.3333	1.4441
Texas	1272	0.8076	1322	0.8135	0.8106	~~21~~	17	18	19	18	~~16~~	18.00	0.72	.510	0.64	2.1706	7	0.3	-1.2500	1.2206
Florida State	1124	0.7137	1128	0.6942	0.7039	~~18~~	~~18~~	~~21~~	18	19	20	18.75	0.80	.583	1.00	2.5039	4		-1.3333	1.1706
Ohio State	1168	0.7416	1208	0.7434	0.7425	20	20	~~22~~	22	20	~~19~~	20.50	0.84	.576	0.92	2.5025	5		-1.4118	1.0907
Kansas State	1039	0.6597	1151	0.7083	0.6840	~~10~~	~~14~~	14	14	13	13	13.50	0.56	.551	0.84	2.0840	8	1.0	-2.0000	1.0840
Miami (OH)	1019	0.6470	756	0.4652	0.5561	~~4~~	16	17	20	~~23~~	22	18.75	0.80	.408	0.16	1.5161	14		-0.6667	0.8494
Iowa	839	0.5327	771	0.4745	0.5036	12	~~10~~	11	13	~~14~~	14	12.50	0.52	.558	0.88	1.9036	11	0.8	-2.0000	0.7036
Tennessee	1145	0.7270	1228	0.7557	0.7413	16	~~10~~	16	~~15~~	16	15	15.75	0.64	.482	0.48	1.8613	10	0.2	-1.4706	0.5907
Georgia	999	0.6343	1018	0.6265	0.6304	~~14~~	15	15	16	17	~~18~~	15.75	0.64	.492	0.56	1.8304	12	0.1	-1.7813	0.1491
TCU	429	0.2724	392	0.2412	0.2568	~~15~~	11	13	~~2~~	~~4~~	11	9.75	0.44	.389	0.08	0.7768	19		-0.6667	0.1101
Boise State	557	0.3537	540	0.3323	0.3430	~~5~~	~~13~~	10	5	9	10	8.50	0.36	.352	0.04	0.7430	20		-0.8571	-0.1142
Florida	550	0.3492	619	0.3809	0.3651	~~2~~	~~12~~	3	11	10	~~8~~	8.00	0.32	.578	0.96	1.6451	13	0.5	-2.4615	-0.3165
Purdue	762	0.4838	849	0.5225	0.5031	11	~~9~~	9	~~12~~	11	9	10.00	0.48	.482	0.48	1.4631	15		-1.8500	-0.3869
Oklahoma State	263	0.1670	299	0.1840	0.1755	7	~~1~~	5	~~10~~	6	4	5.50	0.16	.461	0.28	0.6155	22	0.3	-1.7903	-0.8748
Nebraska	337	0.2140	278	0.1711	0.1925	~~9~~	~~9~~	8	8	8	6	7.50	0.28	.491	0.52	0.9925	17		-1.9655	-0.9730
Utah	80	0.0508	106	0.0652	0.0580	~~13~~	~~6~~	12	9	7	7	8.75	0.40	.478	0.40	0.8580	18		-2.0000	-1.1420
Bowling Green	257	0.1632	95	0.0585	0.1108	~~9~~	0	4	7	~~12~~	12	5.75	0.20	.450	0.20	0.5108	23		-1.6765	-1.1657
Washington State	699	0.4438	638	0.3926	0.4182	~~8~~	7	7	~~4~~	5	5	6.00	0.24	.501	0.60	1.2582	16		-2.4545	-1.1963
Mississippi	524	0.3327	637	0.3920	0.3623	3	~~6~~	~~2~~	6	2	2	3.25	0.08	.453	0.24	0.6823	21		-2.0556	-1.3732
Maryland	134	0.0851	221	0.1360	0.1105	1	~~0~~	~~6~~	3	3	3	2.50	0.04	.470	0.32	0.4705	24		-2.0769	-1.6064
Minnesota	379	0.2406	134	0.0825	0.1615	~~0~~	~~2~~	0	0	0	0	0.00	0.00	.393	0.12	0.2815	25		-2.0000	-1.7185

First Round	Game #	Location	Date	Bowl
#9 Kansas State @ #8 Ohio State	G1	Columbus, OH	12/13/2003	
#10 Miami (OH) @ #7 Florida State	G2	Tallahassee, FL	12/13/2003	
Second Round				
Winner of G1 @ #1 Oklahoma	G3	Norman, OK	12/20/2003	
#5 Miami, FL @ #4 LSU	G4	Baton Rouge, LA	12/20/2003	
#6 Texas @ #3 USC	G5	Los Angeles, CA	12/20/2003	
Winner of G2 @ #2 Michigan	G6	Ann Arbor, MI	12/20/2003	
Semifinals				
Winner of G3 vs. Winner of G4	G7	New Orleans, LA	1/1/2004	Sugar Bowl
Winner of G5 vs. Winner G6	G8	Miami, FL	1/1/2004	Orange Bowl
National Championship	G9	New Orleans, LA	1/8/2004	National Championship
Winner of G7 vs. Winner of G8				

2003 BCS POLL - Final Rankings

Bowl Championship Series Rankings

December 7, 2003

		POLLS			COMPUTER RANKINGS								SOS					
Rank	Team	AP	COACH	POLL AVG	A&H	RB	CM	KM	NYT	JS	PW	COMP AVG	RANK	PTS	LOSS	Sub Total	QW	Total
1	Oklahoma	3	3	3	1	1	1	2	5	1	1	1.17	11	0.44	1	5.61	-0.5	5.11
2	Louisiana State	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	2	2	2	1.83	29	1.16	1	5.99		5.99
3	Southern Cal	1	1	1	3	3	3	3	1	4	3	2.67	37	1.48	1	6.15		6.15
4	Michigan	4	4	4	7	4	6	5	3	5	5	4.67	14	0.56	2	11.23	-0.6	10.63
5	Ohio State	7	6	6.5	6	6	4	4	8	6	7	5.50	7	0.28	2	14.28		14.28
6	Texas	5	5	5	5	9	8	7	4	8	10	6.83	20	0.80	2	14.63	-0.1	14.53
7	Florida State	9	8	8.5	8	8	5	8	7	7	6	6.83	15	0.60	2	17.93		17.93
8	Tennessee	6	7	6.5	10	7	10	11	9	10	11	9.50	46	1.84	2	19.84	-0.2	19.64
9	Miami FL	10	9	9.5	9	5	7	9	10	11	9	8.17	13	0.52	2	20.19	-0.4	19.79
10	Kansas State	8	10	9	16	12	12	12	6	13	13	11.33	10	0.40	3	23.73	-1.0	22.73
11	Miami OH	14	15	14.5	4	10	9	6	22	3	4	6.00	68	2.72	1	24.22		24.22
12	Georgia	11	11	11	12	11	11	10	12	9	8	10.17	18	0.72	3	24.89	-0.3	24.59
13	Iowa	13	12	12.5	14	16	15	13	15	12	12	13.50	16	0.64	3	29.64	-0.7	28.94
14	Purdue	12	13	12.5	15	17	17	14	18	15	17	15.83	40	1.60	3	32.93		32.93
15	Florida	17	17	17	24	14	23	15	13	16	18	16.50	5	0.20	4	37.70	-0.9	36.80
16	Washington St.	15	14	14.5	18	19	19	22	21	21	21	19.83	44	1.76	3	39.09		39.09
17	Boise State	18	16	17	21	13	16	21	34	17	16	17.33	105	4.20	1	39.53		39.53
18	TCU	19	19	19	11	15	13	24	39	22	15	16.67	95	3.80	1	40.47		40.47
19	Mississippi	16	18	17	23	20	24	20	17	24	24	21.33	70	2.80	3	44.13		44.13
20	Nebraska	22	21	21.5	17	29	18	18	19.5	18	20	18.42	32	1.28	3	44.20		44.20
21	Oklahoma State	21	22	21.5	19	25	21	16	16	20	22	19.00	58	2.32	3	45.82	-0.1	45.72
22	Utah	25	25	25	13	21	14	17	33	19	19	17.17	59	2.36	2	46.53		46.53
23	Maryland	23	24	23.5	25	31	20	23	11	23	23	20.83	56	2.24	3	49.57		49.57
24	Bowling Green	26	30	28	29	26	22	19	36	14	14	20.67	36	1.44	3	53.11		53.11
25	Minnesota	24	20	22	27	24	28	28	28	32	28	27.17	83	3.32	3	55.49		55.49

2004 FINAL STANDINGS

Team	Pts. Coach	% Coach	Pts. AP	% AP	Poll Avg.	AH	RB	CM	KM	JS	PW	Comp. Avg.	Comp. Pts.	SOS	SOS Comp	Subtotal	Subtotal Rank	Quality Win	Loss Comp	Final Score
Oklahoma	1459	0.9567	1556	0.9575	0.9571	~~25~~	25	~~24~~	24	25	25	24.75	1.00	.557	0.56	2.5171	3	0.9	0.0000	3.4171
USC	1490	0.9770	1599	0.9840	0.9805	~~24~~	24	~~25~~	25	24	24	24.25	0.96	.603	0.84	2.7805	1	0.5	0.0000	3.2805
Auburn	1435	0.9410	1525	0.9385	0.9397	~~23~~	~~23~~	23	23	23	23	23.00	0.92	.514	0.36	2.2197	4	0.7	0.0000	2.9197
Texas	1281	0.8400	1337	0.8228	0.8314	~~21~~	~~22~~	22	22	22	22	22.00	0.88	.619	0.88	2.5914	2		-0.5000	2.0914
Utah	1215	0.7967	1345	0.8277	0.8122	~~22~~	~~20~~	21	21	20	21	20.75	0.84	.450	0.20	1.8522	8		0.0000	1.8522
California	1286	0.8433	1399	0.8609	0.8521	20	~~18~~	20	20	~~21~~	20	20.00	0.80	.528	0.40	2.0521	6		-0.5000	1.5521
Boise State	943	0.6184	960	0.5908	0.6046	~~19~~	~~21~~	19	19	19	19	19.00	0.76	.439	0.16	1.5246	13		0.0000	1.5246
Georgia	1117	0.7325	1117	0.6874	0.7099	17	~~19~~	18	17	~~15~~	15	16.75	0.72	.572	0.72	2.1499	5	0.1	-1.1429	1.1071
LSU	932	0.6111	929	0.5717	0.5914	16	~~17~~	~~15~~	16	16	17	16.25	0.68	.556	0.52	1.7914	10		-1.0952	0.6962
Louisville	1066	0.6990	1183	0.7280	0.7135	~~9~~	12	13	11	~~17~~	16	13.00	0.52	.435	0.12	1.3535	15		-0.6875	0.6660
Virginia Tech	1037	0.6800	1111	0.6837	0.6818	~~13~~	15	~~14~~	~~18~~	18	18	16.25	0.68	.475	0.24	1.6018	12	0.4	-1.3529	0.6489
Iowa	812	0.5325	948	0.5834	0.5579	~~18~~	14	17	10	~~9~~	14	13.75	0.56	.568	0.68	1.7979	9		-1.2941	0.5038
Tennessee	559	0.3666	651	0.4006	0.3836	12	~~11~~	11	~~14~~	11	11	11.25	0.48	.529	0.44	1.3036	16	0.6	-1.7500	0.1536
Arizona State	173	0.1134	222	0.1366	0.1250	15	~~9~~	~~16~~	15	13	13	14.00	0.60	.669	0.96	1.6850	11	0.2	-2.0400	-0.1550
Michigan	874	0.5731	917	0.5643	0.5687	14	~~16~~	12	3	~~2~~	9	9.50	0.36	.507	0.32	1.2487	17	0.2	-1.6923	-0.2436
Miami	738	0.4839	776	0.4775	0.4807	11	~~13~~	~~10~~	12	12	10	11.25	0.48	.635	0.92	1.8807	7		-2.3182	-0.4374
Virginia	455	0.2984	482	0.2966	0.2975	~~6~~	~~9~~	7	9	8	6	7.50	0.32	.560	0.60	1.2175	18		-1.9615	-0.7441
Wisconsin	599	0.3928	648	0.3988	0.3958	7	~~10~~	6	~~1~~	3	8	6.00	0.24	.394	0.08	0.7158	23		-1.6429	-0.9271
Texas Tech	234	0.1534	168	0.1034	0.1284	4	~~0~~	4	6	~~7~~	5	4.75	0.16	.576	0.76	1.0484	21	0.5	-2.5000	-0.9516
Texas A&M	147	0.0964	213	0.1311	0.1137	10	~~0~~	9	13	~~14~~	12	11.00	0.40	.679	1.00	1.5137	14		-2.5000	-0.9863
Florida State	643	0.4216	647	0.3982	0.4099	~~8~~	4	8	5	5	4	5.50	0.20	.547	0.48	1.0899	20		-2.4750	-1.3851
Oklahoma State	35	0.0230	16	0.0098	0.0164	5	~~0~~	5	8	~~10~~	7	6.25	0.28	.598	0.80	1.0964	19		-2.5000	-1.4036
Ohio State	181	0.1187	155	0.0954	0.1070	3	~~8~~	1	~~0~~	0	0	1.00	0.12	.561	0.64	0.8670	22		-2.9032	-2.0362
Pittsburgh	318	0.2085	415	0.2554	0.2320	~~0~~	~~6~~	0	0	0	0	0.00	0.08	.425	0.04	0.3520	25		-2.7500	-2.3980
Florida	324	0.2125	325	0.2000	0.2062	~~0~~	~~5~~	0	0	0	0	0.00	0.08	.491	0.28	0.5662	24		-3.0000	-2.4338

First Round	Game #	Location	Date	Bowl
#9 LSU @ #8 Georgia	G1	Athens, GA	12/11/2004	
#10 Louisville @ #7 Boise State	G2	Boise, ID	12/11/2004	
Second Round				
Winner of G1 @ #1 Oklahoma	G3	Norman, OK	12/18/2004	
#5 Utah @ #4 Texas	G4	Austin, TX	12/18/2004	
#6 California @ #3 Auburn	G5	Auburn, AL	12/18/2004	
Winner of G2 @ #2 USC	G6	Los Angeles, CA	12/18/2004	
Semifinals				
Winner of G3 vs. Winner of G4	G7	Tempe, AZ	1/1/2005	Fiesta Bowl
Winner of G5 vs. Winner G6	G8	Pasadena, CA	1/1/2005	Rose Bowl
National Championship	G9	Tempe, AZ	1/8/2005	National Championship
Winner of G7 vs. Winner of G8				

2004 BCS POLL - Final Rankings

Bowl Championship Series Rankings

December 6, 2004

	Associated Press			ESPN/USA Today			Computer Rankings								BCS	
Team	Rank	Points	%	Rank	Points	%	A&H	RB	CM	KM	JS	PW	%	Computer Avg	BCS Avg	Previous
1 USC	1	1599	.9840	1	1490	.9770	24	24	25	25	24	24	.970	2	.9770	1
2 Oklahoma	2	1556	.9575	2	1459	.9567	25	25	24	24	25	25	.990	1	.9681	2
3 Auburn	3	1525	.9385	3	1435	.9410	23	23	23	23	23	23	.920	3	.9331	3
4 Texas	6	1337	.8228	5	1281	.8400	21	22	22	22	22	22	.880	4	.8476	5
5 California	4	1399	.8609	4	1286	.8433	20	18	20	20	21	20	.800	6	.8347	4
6 Utah	5	1345	.8277	6	1215	.7967	22	20	21	21	20	21	.830	5	.8181	6
7 Georgia	8	1117	.6874	7	1117	.7325	17	19	18	17	15	15	.670	8	.6966	7
8 Virginia Tech	9	1111	.6837	9	1037	.6800	13	15	14	18	18	18	.650	9	.6712	12
9 Boise State	10	960	.5908	10	943	.6184	19	21	19	19	19	19	.760	7	.6564	8
10 Louisville	7	1183	.7280	8	1066	.6990	9	12	13	11	17	16	.520	13	.6490	9
11 LSU	12	929	.5717	11	932	.6111	16	17	15	16	16	17	.650	9	.6109	11
12 Iowa	11	948	.5834	13	812	.5325	18	14	17	10	9	14	.550	12	.5553	13
13 Michigan	13	917	.5643	12	874	.5731	14	16	12	3	2	9	.380	17	.5058	14
14 Miami	14	776	.4775	14	738	.4839	11	13	10	12	12	10	.450	14	.4705	10
15 Tennessee	15	651	.4006	17	559	.3666	12	11	11	14	11	11	.450	14	.4057	15
16 Florida State	17	647	.3982	15	643	.4216	8	4	8	5	5	4	.220	21	.3466	16
17 Wisconsin	16	648	.3988	16	599	.3928	7	10	6	1	3	8	.240	20	.3439	17
18 Virginia	18	482	.2966	18	455	.2984	6	9	7	9	8	6	.300	18	.2983	18
19 Arizona State	21	222	.1366	24	173	.1134	15	0	16	15	13	13	.560	11	.2700	19
20 Texas A&M	22	213	.1311	25	147	.0964	10	0	9	13	14	12	.440	16	.2225	20
21 Pittsburgh	19	415	.2554	20	318	.2085	0	6	0	0	0	0	.000	NR	.1546	23
22 Texas Tech	23	168	.1034	21	234	.1534	4	0	4	6	7	5	.190	22	.1489	21
23 Florida	20	325	.2000	19	324	.2125	0	5	0	0	0	0	.000	NR	.1375	22
24 Oklahoma State	32	16	.0098	28	35	.0230	5	0	5	8	10	7	.250	19	.0943	24
25 Ohio State	24	155	.0954	22	181	.1187	3	8	1	0	0	0	.040	NR	.0847	25

2006 FINAL STANDINGS

Team	Pts. Coach	% Coach	Pts. Harris	% Harris	Poll Avg.	AH	RB	CM	KM	JS	PW	Comp. Avg.	Comp. Pts.	SOS	SOS Comp	Subtotal	Subtotal Rank	Quality Win	Loss Comp	Final Score
Ohio State	1550	1.0000	2824	0.9996	0.9998	~~25~~	25	~~24~~	25	25	25	25.00	1.00	.531	0.60	2.5998	4	1.0	0.0000	3.5998
Florida	1470	0.9484	2670	0.9451	0.9468	24	~~23~~	~~25~~	24	23	23	23.50	0.96	.583	0.80	2.7068	2	0.7	-0.6000	2.8068
Michigan	1444	0.9316	2632	0.9317	0.9316	~~23~~	~~24~~	23	23	24	~~24~~	23.50	0.96	.596	0.84	2.7316	1	0.4	-0.5000	2.6316
Auburn	1000	0.6452	1725	0.6106	0.6279	17	~~12~~	17	~~20~~	19	16	17.25	0.72	.510	0.48	1.8279	8	1.5	-1.3889	1.9390
USC	1173	0.7568	2173	0.7692	0.7630	20	~~18~~	~~22~~	22	22	22	21.50	0.88	.698	1.00	2.6430	3	0.6	-1.5625	1.6805
Boise State	1053	0.6794	1950	0.6903	0.6848	19	~~16~~	~~20~~	19	20	18	19.00	0.76	.400	0.08	1.5248	11		0.0000	1.5248
Louisville	1223	0.7890	2272	0.8042	0.7966	21	~~22~~	21	17	~~13~~	20	19.75	0.80	.507	0.44	2.0366	6		-0.6000	1.4366
LSU	1299	0.8381	2372	0.8396	0.8389	~~22~~	~~17~~	19	21	21	21	20.50	0.84	.533	0.68	2.3589	5	0.1	-1.1364	1.3225
Wisconsin	1263	0.8148	2229	0.7890	0.8019	~~11~~	~~21~~	16	13	18	17	16.00	0.64	.392	0.04	1.4819	12		-0.5455	0.9365
Notre Dame	923	0.5955	1725	0.6106	0.6031	18	~~15~~	18	15	17	~~19~~	17.00	0.68	.532	0.64	1.9231	7		-1.1429	0.7802
Rutgers	567	0.3658	1083	0.3834	0.3746	~~16~~	11	12	~~10~~	11	14	12.00	0.48	.461	0.28	1.1346	19	0.5	-1.4118	0.2228
Arkansas	798	0.5148	1483	0.5250	0.5199	10	~~9~~	10	~~18~~	16	15	12.75	0.56	.500	0.40	1.4799	13	0.4	-1.7344	0.1455
West Virginia	800	0.5161	1485	0.5257	0.5209	14	13	~~15~~	11	~~8~~	10	12.00	0.48	.493	0.36	1.3609	14		-1.2632	0.0977
Tennessee	500	0.3226	940	0.3327	0.3277	13	~~10~~	11	~~14~~	14	12	12.50	0.52	.544	0.72	1.5677	10	0.2	-1.7813	-0.0136
Oregon State	72	0.0465	127	0.0450	0.0457	7	~~0~~	7	~~12~~	12	~~8~~	8.50	0.36	.605	0.88	1.2857	17	0.8	-2.2353	-0.1496
Oklahoma	1115	0.7194	1977	0.6998	0.7096	15	~~10~~	13	8	~~7~~	11	11.75	0.40	.457	0.24	1.3496	15		-1.5000	-0.1504
Virginia Tech	781	0.5039	1358	0.4807	0.4923	8	~~20~~	9	6	4	7	7.50	0.28	.476	0.32	1.0923	20		-1.3889	-0.2966
California	436	0.2813	736	0.2605	0.2709	12	~~7~~	14	~~16~~	15	13	13.50	0.60	.632	0.92	1.7909	9		-2.1600	-0.3691
Wake Forest	745	0.4806	1366	0.4835	0.4821	9	~~14~~	8	7	~~6~~	9	8.25	0.32	.417	0.12	0.9221	21		-1.3333	-0.4112
Texas	582	0.3755	952	0.3370	0.3562	~~6~~	4	~~6~~	~~0~~	0	5	3.75	0.20	.550	0.76	1.3162	16		-1.9286	-0.6123
Brigham Young	369	0.2381	838	0.2966	0.2674	4	1	~~5~~	~~0~~	0	4	2.25	0.16	.426	0.16	0.5874	24		-1.6000	-1.0126
Texas A&M	303	0.1955	551	0.1950	0.1953	3	~~8~~	2	~~0~~	0	0	1.25	0.12	.452	0.20	0.5153	25		-2.1111	-1.5958
Nebraska	242	0.1561	352	0.1246	0.1404	~~0~~	~~0~~	0	0	0	0	0.00	0.04	.513	0.52	0.7004	23		-2.7222	-2.0219
Boston College	175	0.1129	318	0.1126	0.1127	1	~~0~~	4	0	0	3	1.00	0.08	.517	0.56	0.7527	22		-2.7750	-2.0223
UCLA	0	0.0000	10	0.0035	0.0018	5	~~2~~	3	9	~~10~~	2	4.75	0.24	.668	0.96	1.2018	18	0.8	-4.0541	-2.0523

First Round	Game #	Location	Date	Bowl
#9 Wisconsin @ #8 LSU	G1	Baton Rouge, LA	12/9/2006	
#10 Notre Dame @ #7 Louisville	G2	Louisville, KY	12/9/2006	
Second Round				
Winner of G1 @ #1 Ohio State	G3	Columbus, OH	12/16/2006	
#5 USC @ #4 Auburn	G4	Auburn, AL	12/16/2006	
#6 Boise State @ #3 Michigan	G5	Ann Arbor, MI	12/16/2006	
Winner of G2 @ #2 Florida	G6	Gainsville, FL	12/16/2006	
Semifinals				
Winner of G3 vs. Winner of G4	G7	Pasadena, CA	1/1/2007	Rose Bowl
Winner of G5 vs. Winner G6	G8	Tempe, AZ	1/1/2007	Fiesta Bowl
National Championship	G9	Pasadena, CA	1/8/2007	National Championship
Winner of G7 vs. Winner of G8				

2006 FINAL BCS STANDINGS

		Harris Poll			USA Today			Computer Rankings							BCS		
	TEAM	RK	PTS	%	RK	PTS	%	AH	RB	CM	KM	JS	PW	%	CPU	BCS AVG	PVS
1	Ohio State	1	2824	**0.9996**	1	1550	**1.0000**	25	25	24	25	25	25	1.000	**1**	**0.9999**	1
2	Florida	2	2670	**0.9451**	2	1470	**0.9484**	24	23	25	24	23	23	0.940	**T-2**	**0.9445**	4
3	Michigan	3	2632	**0.9317**	3	1444	**0.9316**	23	24	23	23	24	24	0.940	**T-2**	**0.9344**	3
4	LSU	4	2372	**0.8396**	4	1299	**0.8381**	22	17	19	21	21	21	0.820	**5**	**0.8326**	5
5	USC	7	2173	**0.7692**	7	1173	**0.7568**	20	18	22	22	22	22	0.860	**4**	**0.7953**	2
6	Louisville	5	2272	**0.8042**	6	1223	**0.7890**	21	22	21	17	13	20	0.790	**6**	**0.7944**	6
7	Wisconsin	6	2229	**0.7890**	5	1263	**0.8148**	11	21	16	13	18	17	0.640	**10**	**0.7480**	7
8	Boise State	9	1950	**0.6903**	9	1053	**0.6794**	19	16	20	19	20	18	0.760	**7**	**0.7099**	8
9	Auburn	10	1725	**0.6106**	10	1000	**0.6452**	17	12	17	20	19	16	0.690	**8**	**0.6486**	11
10	Oklahoma	8	1977	**0.6998**	8	1115	**0.7194**	15	19	13	8	7	11	0.470	**16**	**0.6297**	12
11	Notre Dame	10	1725	**0.6106**	11	923	**0.5955**	18	15	18	15	17	19	0.680	**9**	**0.6287**	10
12	Arkansas	13	1483	**0.5250**	13	798	**0.5148**	10	9	10	18	16	15	0.510	**12**	**0.5166**	9
13	West Virginia	12	1485	**0.5257**	12	800	**0.5161**	14	13	15	11	8	10	0.480	**T-14**	**0.5073**	15
14	Wake Forest	14	1366	**0.4835**	15	745	**0.4806**	9	14	8	7	5	9	0.330	**18**	**0.4314**	17
15	Virginia Tech	15	1358	**0.4807**	14	781	**0.5039**	8	20	9	6	4	7	0.300	**19**	**0.4282**	14
16	Rutgers	16	1083	**0.3834**	17	567	**0.3658**	16	11	12	10	11	14	0.480	**T-14**	**0.4097**	13
17	Tennessee	18	940	**0.3327**	18	500	**0.3226**	13	10	11	14	14	12	0.500	**13**	**0.3851**	16
18	California	20	736	**0.2605**	19	436	**0.2813**	12	7	14	16	15	13	0.540	**11**	**0.3606**	18
19	Texas	17	952	**0.3370**	16	582	**0.3755**	6	4	6	0	0	5	0.150	**T-21**	**0.2875**	19
20	Brigham Young	19	838	**0.2966**	20	369	**0.2381**	4	1	5	0	0	4	0.090	**23**	**0.2082**	21
21	Texas A&M	21	551	**0.1950**	21	303	**0.1955**	3	8	2	0	0	0	0.050	**T-24**	**0.1468**	23
22	Oregon State	26	127	**0.0450**	25	72	**0.0465**	7	0	7	12	12	8	0.340	**17**	**0.1438**	24
23	Nebraska	22	352	**0.1246**	22	242	**0.1561**	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.000	**NR**	**0.0936**	20
24	Boston College	23	318	**0.1126**	23	175	**0.1129**	1	0	4	0	0	3	0.040	**NR**	**0.0885**	NR
25	UCLA	33	10	**0.0035**	NR	0	**0.0000**	5	2	3	9	10	2	0.190	**20**	**0.0645**	NR

2007 FINAL STANDINGS

Team	Pts. Coach	% Coach	Pts. Harris	% Harris	Poll Avg.	AH	RB	CM	KM	JS	PW	Comp. Avg.	Comp. Pts.	SOS	SOS Comp	Subtotal	Quality Win	Loss Comp	Final Score
LSU	1418	0.9453	2630	0.9228	0.9341	1	1	1	1	1	1	1.00	0.96	.514	0.76	2.6541	1.0	-1.6000	2.0541
Oklahoma	1331	0.8873	2520	0.8842	0.8858	2	2	2	2	2	2	2.00	0.80	.454	0.32	2.0058	1.4	-1.7143	1.6915
Virginia Tech	1242	0.8280	2345	0.8228	0.8254	3	3	3	3	3	3	3.00	1.00	.541	0.96	2.7854	0.1	-1.2381	1.6473
Ohio State	1469	0.9793	2813	0.9870	0.9832	4	4	4	4	4	4	4.00	0.92	.441	0.24	2.1432		-0.6667	1.4765
Hawaii	994	0.6627	1903	0.6677	0.6652	5	5	5	5	5	5	5.00	0.56	.205	0.04	1.2652		0.0000	1.2652
Kansas	1099	0.7327	2092	0.7340	0.7334	6	6	6	6	6	6	6.00	0.84	.407	0.12	1.6934		-0.5909	1.1024
Missouri	1104	0.7360	2117	0.7428	0.7394	7	7	7	7	7	7	7.00	0.88	.511	0.64	2.2594		-1.1818	1.0776
Georgia	1277	0.8513	2469	0.8663	0.8588	8	8	8	8	8	8	8.00	0.80	.514	0.76	2.4188		-1.6000	0.8188
Arizona State	900	0.6000	1628	0.5712	0.5856	9	9	9	9	9	9	9.00	0.72	.514	0.76	2.0656		-1.3333	0.7323
Boston College	617	0.4113	1124	0.3944	0.4029	12	12	15	15	16	15	14.25	0.52	.540	0.92	1.8429	1.0	-2.3125	0.5304
USC	1227	0.8180	2346	0.8232	0.8206	17	23	14	14	17	17	16.25	0.68	.458	0.40	1.9006	0.5	-2.0000	0.4006
West Virginia	1010	0.6733	1924	0.6751	0.6742	16	15	20	13	15	18	16.00	0.64	.491	0.56	1.8742		-1.7143	0.1599
Illinois	747	0.4980	1400	0.4912	0.4946	13	13	7	9	8	9	9.75	0.40	.534	0.88	1.7746	0.6	-2.2200	0.1546
Florida	890	0.5933	1786	0.6267	0.6100	15	14	19	19	14	14	15.50	0.60	.483	0.52	1.7300		-1.9138	-0.1838
Clemson	567	0.3780	1041	0.3653	0.3716	7	3	11	12	12	11	10.25	0.44	.515	0.80	1.6116		-2.0357	-0.4241
South Florida	115	0.0767	362	0.1270	0.1018	10	9	13	10	11	12	10.75	0.48	.523	0.84	1.4218	0.2	-2.1600	-0.5382
Tennessee	480	0.3200	870	0.3053	0.3126	11	6	9	11	9	5	8.75	0.36	.560	1.00	1.6726	0.8	-3.0625	-0.5899
BYU	462	0.3080	912	0.3200	0.3140	8	7	10	2	3	10	7.00	0.28	.467	0.44	1.0340		-1.6667	-0.6327
Wisconsin	594	0.3960	1079	0.3786	0.3873	3	11	9	5	0	2	2.50	0.12	.437	0.20	0.7073		-1.9286	-1.2213
Boise State	246	0.1640	541	0.1898	0.1769	9	10	0	0	0	0	0.00	0.04	.314	0.08	0.2969		-1.5625	-1.2656
Connecticut	23	0.0153	52	0.0182	0.0168	9	8	3	3	6	7	4.75	0.24	.446	0.28	0.5368		-1.9286	-1.3918
Texas	498	0.3320	983	0.3449	0.3385	5	9	4	0	0	4	2.00	0.08	.476	0.48	0.8985		-2.4130	-1.5146
Auburn	289	0.1927	448	0.1572	0.1749	2	9	2	8	7	1	3.00	0.16	.494	0.60	0.9349		-2.6486	-1.7137
Virginia	332	0.2213	551	0.1933	0.2073	6	2	8	7	10	8	7.25	0.32	.456	0.36	0.8873		-2.6429	-1.7555
Cincinnati	215	0.1433	580	0.2035	0.1734	1	5	6	4	4	6	4.75	0.24	.434	0.16	0.5734		-2.5714	-1.9980

First Round	Game #	Location	Date	Bowl
#9 Arizona State @ #8 Georgia	G1	Athens, GA	12/8/2007	
#10 Boston College @ #7 Missouri	G2	Columbia, MO	12/8/2007	
Second Round				
Winner of G1 @ #1 LSU	G3	Baton Rouge, LA	12/15/2007	
#5 Hawaii @ #4 Ohio State	G4	Columbus, OH	12/15/2007	
#6 Kansas @ #3 Virginia Tech	G5	Blacksburg, VA	12/15/2007	
Winner of G2 @ #2 Oklahoma	G6	Norman, OK	12/15/2007	
Semifinals				
Winner of G3 vs. Winner of G4	G7	New Orleans, LA	1/1/2008	Sugar Bowl
Winner of G5 vs. Winner G6	G8	Miami, FL	1/1/2008	Orange Bowl
National Championship	G9	New Orleans, LA	1/8/2008	National Championship
Winner of G7 vs. Winner of G8				

BCS Standings - December 2, 2007

		Harris Poll			USA Today			Computer Rankings								BCS	
	TEAM	RK	PTS	%	RK	PTS	%	A&H	RB	CM	KM	JS	PW	%	COMP AVG	BCS AVG	PRVS
1	Ohio State	1	2813	.9870	1	1469	.9793	25	25	21	23	22	21	.910	3	.9588	3
2	LSU	2	2630	.9228	2	1418	.9453	21	24	25	24	24	23	.950	2	.9394	7
3	Virginia Tech	6	2345	.8228	5	1242	.8280	22	22	24	25	25	25	.960	1	.8703	6
4	Oklahoma	3	2520	.8842	3	1331	.8873	18	21	18	18	23	24	.800	T-6	.8572	9
5	Georgia	4	2469	.8663	4	1277	.8513	20	17	23	22	19	19	.800	T-6	.8392	4
6	Missouri	7	2117	.7428	7	1104	.7360	24	16	22	21	20	22	.850	4	.7763	1
7	USC	5	2346	.8232	6	1227	.8180	17	23	14	14	17	17	.650	9	.7637	8
8	Kansas	8	2092	.7340	8	1099	.7327	23	20	16	20	21	20	.810	5	.7589	5
9	West Virginia	9	1924	.6751	9	1010	.6733	16	15	20	13	15	18	.640	10	.6628	2
10	Hawaii	10	1903	.6677	10	994	.6627	14	18	12	16	18	13	.610	12	.6468	12
11	Arizona State	12	1628	.5712	11	900	.6000	19	19	17	17	13	16	.690	8	.6204	13
12	Florida	11	1786	.6267	12	890	.5933	15	14	19	19	14	14	.620	11	.6133	10
13	Illinois	13	1400	.4912	13	747	.4980	13	13	7	9	8	9	.390	16	.4597	15
14	Boston College	14	1124	.3944	14	617	.4113	12	12	15	15	16	15	.570	13	.4586	11
15	Clemson	16	1041	.3653	16	567	.3780	7	3	11	12	12	11	.410	15	.3844	16
16	Tennessee	19	870	.3053	18	480	.3200	11	6	9	11	9	5	.350	17	.3251	14
17	BYU	18	912	.3200	19	462	.3080	8	7	10	2	3	10	.280	19	.3027	19
18	Wisconsin	15	1079	.3786	15	594	.3960	3	11	0	5	0	2	.100	24	.2915	18
19	Texas	17	983	.3449	17	498	.3320	5	0	4	0	0	4	.080	25	.2523	20
20	Virginia	21	551	.1933	20	332	.2213	6	2	8	7	10	8	.290	18	.2349	22
21	South Florida	24	362	.1270	25	115	.0767	10	0	13	10	11	12	.430	14	.2112	21
22	Cincinnati	20	580	.2035	23	215	.1433	1	5	6	4	4	6	.190	T-20	.1789	23
23	Auburn	23	448	.1572	21	289	.1927	2	0	2	8	7	1	.120	23	.1566	24
24	Boise State	22	541	.1898	22	246	.1640	0	10	0	0	0	0	.000	NR	.1179	25
25	UConn	29	52	.0182	T-28	23	.0153	0	8	3	3	6	7	.190	T-20	.0745	NR